

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached drawing sheets (six (6) total) include formal drawings for Figs. 1 – 18. The sheets replace the original sheets that included Figs. 1 – 18.

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 7, 10 – 14, and 56 – 67 are pending in this application. Applicant has amended claims 7 and 13. Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 9, and 15 – 55 are canceled. Applicant has added claims 56 – 67.

The Examiner has objected to Figs. 1 – 18 for poor hand drawn lines and poor copy quality. Applicant includes with this Response formal drawings for Figs. 1 – 18. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests acceptance of Figs. 1 – 18.

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Particularly, the Examiner states, “In line 1, “other material” lacks proper antecedent basis within the claims. It is assumed that claim 13 is to depend from claim 12.” Applicant has amended claim 13 to depend from claim 12. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Abels (U.S. Patent No. 6,616,445). The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 9, and 12 – 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abels.

Claim 7 has been amended to include the subject matter of dependant claim 8. Amended claim 7 recites an orthodontic bracket comprising a body that includes a lingual surface for attachment to a tooth, and the body defines an archwire slot. The orthodontic bracket also includes a clip that comprises at least two different materials where one material coats the other. The clip is movable between an open position to permit access to the archwire slot and a closed position to inhibit access to the archwire slot.

Abels discloses an orthodontic bracket 60 that includes a ligation cover 74 (Fig. 5A). A spring 80 extends from an inner surface of the ligation cover 74. The spring 80 can be integrally formed with the ligation cover 74, and therefore comprise the same plastic or metal material as

the ligation cover 74, or it may comprise a different material, such as a metallic bearing spring having increased wear resistance when contacted by an archwire.

Abels does not teach or suggest a clip that comprises two different materials where one material coats the other material. At best, Abels suggest connecting a metal spring 80 to a plastic cover 74. But nothing in Abels teaches or suggests that one material coats the other.

Furthermore, it would not have been obvious for of one ordinary skill in the art to coat the spring 80 of Abels. Abels discloses that the spring 80 can be formed from the same plastic or metal material as the ligation cover 74, or it may comprise a different material for increased wear resistance with the archwire. Even though the spring 80 of Abels is formed from a material different than the ligation cover 74 for increased wear resistance with the archwire, Abels does not teach or suggest coating the metal spring 80 with the second material of the ligation cover 74. Accordingly, Abels does not teach or suggest all of the subject matter of amended claim 7 and therefore claim 7 is allowable for these and other reasons. Claims 10 – 14 depend from allowable claim 7 and are therefore allowable for these and other reasons.

New claim 56 combines originally filed claims 7 and 8. Claim 56 is similar to claim 7 but instead recites a clip that comprises two different materials that are laminated to each other. Even though the spring 80 of Abels can be formed from a material different than the ligation cover 74 for increased wear resistance with the archwire, Abels does not teach or suggest laminating the metal spring 80 with the second material of the ligation cover 74. Accordingly, Abels does not teach or suggest all of the subject matter of claim 56 and therefore claim 56 is allowable for these and other reasons. Claims 57 – 61 depend from claim 56 and are therefore allowable for these and other reasons.

New claim 62 recites an orthodontic bracket comprising a body that includes a lingual surface for attachment to a tooth, and the body has an archwire slot that defines a recess. The orthodontic bracket also includes a clip that comprises at least two different materials, and the clip is movable between an open position to permit access to the archwire slot and a closed

position to inhibit access to the archwire slot. Referring to Fig. 3 of the present application, the clip 18 includes a free end 54 positioned in the recess 38 when the clip is in the closed position.

Abels does not teach or suggest a clip that includes a free end positioned in a recess at least partially defined by the archwire slot when the clip is in the close position. Rather, Abels discloses a ligation cover 14 that includes locking notches 32 within a latch member 31 that assist in locking the ligation cover 14 over a protrusion 34 within the bracket base 12 (Figs. 1A and 1B). Abels does not disclose the free end of the ligation cover 14 positioned in a recess at least partially defined by the archwire slot 16. Accordingly, Abels does not teach or suggest all of the subject matter of claim 62 and therefore claim 62 is allowable for these and other reasons. Claims 63 – 67 depend from claim 62 and are therefore allowable for these and other reasons.

For all of these reasons, reconsideration and allowance of the claims 7, 10 – 14 and 56 – 67 are respectfully requested.

Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney should the Examiner have any questions while reviewing the present Response or should the Examiner determine that such action would facilitate the prosecution and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin P. Moran", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kevin P. Moran  
Reg. No. 37,193

Docket No.: 072270-9020-02  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108

(414) 271-6560

X:\clientb\072270\9020\F0214958.1